

REMARKS

This response is submitted in response to an Office Action mailed on January 17, 2008. Claims 1-24 were pending at the time the Office Action was issued. Applicant hereby amends Claims 1, 15, 17-21 and 23, cancels Claims 2, 5, 16, and 24, and adds Claims 25-27. Claims 1, 3-4, 6-15, 17-23, and 25-27 remain pending.

I. REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication 2004/0153995 to Polonovski (hereinafter "Polonovski") in view of U.S. Publication 2004/0006765 to Goldman (hereinafter "Goldman"). Claims 2, 5, 16, and 24 are canceled. Respectfully, Applicant submits that the remaining claims are allowable over the cited references for at least the reasons explained in detail below.

Claims 1 and 3-14

Claims 3-14 depend from Claim 1. Claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. A computer readable storage medium having computer-executable instructions, the instructions comprising:
 - receiving a string in an interactive environment;
 - identifying an attribution within the string that specifies a constraint for an associated construct;
 - identifying the construct associated with the attribution;
 - executing the string in the interactive environment, where executing the string includes using the saved information to apply the attribution to the construct when the construct is encountered during execution.

Applicant traverses the rejection. First, as noted in the Office Action, Polonovski does not disclose executing a string. (Office Action, Page 3, Line 17). Accordingly, Polonovski does recite, “executing the string in the interactive environment, where executing the string includes *using the saved information to apply the attribution to the construct when the construct is encountered during execution*,” as recited in Claim 1. (Emphasis added).

Second, the deficiencies of Polonovski with respect to this element are not remedied by Goldman. Goldman does not disclose the applying an attribution to a constraint during the execution of a string. Instead, Goldman discloses a “novel visual programming environment” in which “aspects of a program’s behavior can be modified while the program runs, without the write-compile, execute cycle that routinely bogs down software development.” (Paragraph 17, Lines 4-8). Modifying a program’s behavior while the program runs, as disclosed by Goldman, does not teach or suggest “apply the attribution to the construct when the construct is encountered during execution,” as claimed in Claim 1.

Furthermore, as noted in the Office Action, Goldman discloses that the user may use menu options in this “visual programming environment” to “assign a value to a variable.” (Office Action, Page 4, Lines 3-4; Goldman, Paragraph 112, Lines 6-7). However, the assignment of a value to a variable does not teach “applying the attribute to the construct,” as claimed in Claim 1, when Claim 1 further recites that the attribution “specifies a *constraint* for an associated construct.” (Emphasis added). In other words, the application of an attribution that specifies a *constraint* for a variable is not the same as assigning a *value* to a variable.

Thus, the cited references to Polonovski and Goldman, whether individually or in combination, do not teach, disclose, or fairly suggest every aspect of Claim 1.

Furthermore, since Claims 3-14 depend from Claim 1, they are at least allowable for the same reasons that make Claim 1 allowable over the cited references, as well as for additional limitations recited.

Claims 15-22

Claims 16-22 depend from Claim 15. Claim 15, as amended, recites:

- 15.A method for handling constraints specified within an interactive environment, the method comprising:
- identifying a pre-defined begin symbol and end symbol within a string entered in an interactive environment;
 - identifying a constraint name between the begin symbol and the end symbol;
 - identifying a construct following the end symbol;
 - saving information that correlates the constraint with the construct; and
 - executing the string in the interactive environment, where executing the string includes using the saved information to apply the constraint to the construct when the construct is encountered during execution.

Applicant traverses the rejection. Specifically, Applicant incorporates the reasoning presented above in response to the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Accordingly, Applicant submits that the cited references to Polonovski and Goldman, whether individually or in combination, do not disclose, teach or fairly suggest, “executing the string in the interactive environment, where executing the string includes *using the saved information to apply the constraint to the construct when the construct is encountered during execution*,” as recited in Claim 15. (Emphasis added).

Furthermore, since Claims 16-22 depend from Claim 15, they are at least allowable for the same reasons that make Claim 15 allowable over the cited references, as well as for additional limitations recited.

Claim 23

Claim 23, as amended, recites:

23. A system the handles input parameters, the system comprising:
 means for processing; and
 means for receiving a string into a command line interactive environment;
 means for identifying an attribution within the string;
 means for identifying a construct associated with the attribution;
 means for saving information that correlates the attribution with the construct; and
 means for using the saved information to apply the attribution to the construct when the construct is encountered during an execution of the string in the command line interactive environment.

Applicant traverses the rejection. First, Applicant incorporates the reasoning presented above in response to the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Accordingly, Applicant submits that the cited references to Polonovski and Goldman, whether individually or in combination, do not disclose, teach or fairly suggest, “means for *using the saved information to apply the attribution to the construct when the construct is encountered during an execution of the string*,” as recited in Claim 23. (Emphasis added).

Second, as noted in the Office Action, Polonovski does not disclose executing a string. (Office Action, Page 8, Line 4). Accordingly, Polonovski does recite, “means for...execution of the string in the *command line interactive environment*,” as claimed in Claim 23. (Emphasis added).

Moreover, the deficiencies of Polonovski with respect to this element are not remedied by Goldman. Goldman discloses a “*visual programming environment*” for software development. (Paragraph 17, Lines 1-4). (Emphasis added). Accordingly, Goldman cannot teach or suggest, “means for...execution of the string in the *command line interactive environment*,” as claimed in Claim 23. (Emphasis added). Thus, the cited references to Polonovski and Goldman, whether individually or in combination, do not teach, disclose, or fairly suggest every aspect of Claim 23.

In closing, Applicant’s decision not to discuss the differences between the cited art and each dependent claim should not be considered as an admission that Applicant concurs with the conclusions set forth in the Office Action that these dependent claims are not patentable over the disclosure in the cited references. Similarly, Applicant’s decision not to discuss differences between the prior art and every claim element, or every comment set forth in the Office Action, should not be considered as an admission that Applicant concurs with the interpretation and assertions presented in the Office Action regarding those claims. Indeed, Applicant believes that all of the dependent claims patentably distinguish over the references cited. Moreover, a specific traverse of the rejection of each dependent claim is not required, since dependent claims are patentable for at least the same reasons as the independent claims from which the dependent claims ultimately depend.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 1, 3-4, 6-15, 17-23, and 25-27 are now in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendment, as well as consideration and prompt allowance of the claims. If any issue remains unresolved that would prevent allowance of this case, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve the issue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dated: 5-9-08

By: 

David S. Lee
Reg. No. 38,222
Elliott Y. Chen
Reg. No. 58,293

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
421 W. Riverside Ave, Suite 500
Spokane, WA 99201
Phone: (206) 315-4001 x104
or (206) 315-7914
Fax: (206) 315-4004